



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

publican institutions, our popular elections, our annual or biennial choice of those who are to rule over us, instead of a rule of hereditary succession supported by pretorian guards, how can they subsist under influences like these ?

"But, Sir, give us twenty-five years of peace." I do believe, that this coming quarter of a century is to be the most important in our whole history. I do beseech you to let us have these twenty-five years at least of peace. Let these fertile wastes be filled up with swarming millions ; let this tide of immigration from Europe go on ; let the steamer, the canal, the railway, and especially let this great Pacific railway, subdue these mighty distances, and bring this vast extension into a span. Let us pay back the ingots of California gold with bars of Atlantic iron. Let agriculture clothe our vast wastes with waving plenty. Let the industrial and mechanic arts erect their peaceful fortresses at our waterfalls. And then, Sir, in the train of this growing population, let the printing-office, the lecture-room, the village school-house, and the village church be scattered all over the country. And in these twenty-five years we shall exhibit a spectacle of national prosperity such as the world has never seen on so large a scale, and yet within the reach of a sober, practical contemplation."

A P P E N D I X .

No. I. *Report of Hon. H. S. FOOTE, to the U. S. Senate, Feb. 5, 1851, from the Committee on Foreign Relations.*

Mr. FOOTE, on presenting this Report, said the Committee were "unanimous and cordial" in its adoption.

"IN SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,

February 5, 1851.—Read and ordered to be printed.

Mr. FOOTE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to whom were referred the memorial of the American Peace Society, and numerous other memorials and petitions, praying the adoption of measures for the amicable adjustment of international controversies, reported the following Resolution :

Whereas appeals to the sword for the determination of national controversies are always productive of immense evils ; and whereas the spirit and enterprises of the age, but more especially the genius of our own government, the habits of our people, and the highest permanent prosperity of our republic, as well as the claims of humanity, the dictates of enlightened reason, and the precepts of our holy religion, all require the adoption of every feasible measure consistent with the national honor, and the security of our rights, to prevent, as far as possible, the recurrence of war hereafter ; therefore,

Resolved, That, in the judgment of this body, it would be proper and desirable for the Government of these United States, wherever practicable, to secure, in its treaties with other nations, a provision for referring to the decision of umpires all future misunderstandings that cannot be satisfactorily adjusted by amicable negotiation, in the first instance, before a resort to hostilities shall be had.'

No. II. *Report of Judge UNDERWOOD, to the U. S. Senate, Feb. 23, 1853, from the Committee on Foreign Relations.*

This able and elaborate Report, in response, as its preamble says, to "the Memorial of the American Peace Society, signed by its principal officers, and various other Memorials, numerously signed, from many States of the Union," enters so fully into the subject as to fill thirteen large octavo pages. Premising that the Committee believe in the right of revolution and of defensive war, it

proceeds to sketch, somewhat in detail, the various evils inseparable from this custom, and then "takes up the inquiry whether it be possible to prescribe a remedy for the evils of war, and, if so, what is the remedy." Under this head, it gives a very strong argument in favor of Stipulated Arbitration, and closes thus:—

"Contemplated in all its aspects, the Committee perceive no evils likely to result from treaty stipulations in favor of referring national disputes to arbitration for adjustment. Believing that much good will result, they do not hesitate to recommend, as a part of our permanent foreign policy, the incorporation of a provision in all treaties to the effect that, should controversies arise, they shall be submitted to the decision of disinterested and impartial arbitrators, to be mutually chosen, with the privilege, on the part of the arbitrators, to select an umpire, in case they are equally divided.

The present state of the world is peculiarly favorable for the introduction of such a policy. The powerful Christian nations are at peace with each other. Their prosperity and happiness have been rapidly advancing during the years of peace they have enjoyed. No greater calamity can befall them than breaking up the peace which so happily prevails.

The United States, of all others, is the proper country to propose this policy to the nations of the earth. We have shown in our past history a capacity for war. The love of military glory is a passion as strong with us as with any other people, if not stronger. Our institutions invite every citizen to become a soldier in time of war. Our ranks are filled with volunteers panting for an opportunity to distinguish themselves. Our young men rush to battle with the full assurance, that the highest civil honors often reward the toils and dangers of the triumphant soldier. Our institutions, therefore, tend to make us a military people. We are rapidly growing in power. Our progress is without a parallel. Under such circumstances, in proposing a policy of peace, it cannot be supposed that we are influenced by any other motives than those which spring from the purest philanthropy. The policy proposed is adverse to aggression. It respects the rights of all nations. Its object is "peace on earth, good will to men."

May we not hope to be successful in our efforts for peace? So far as national arbitrations have been tried, we do not know any case where the award, however complained of, has been productive of a hundredth part of the evil which would have resulted from war. Take any award which has been rendered, concede it to be wrong, admit that the arbitrators were mistaken and erred in judgment, and then weigh and compare the evils which would result from the execution of such award with those which follow a state of war; and it will be found that war is infinitely the greater evil. So far as past experience can be relied on, we think it favors the policy of adopting national arbitrations as the best means of settling national disputes.

There are powerful and rapidly accumulating interests in favor of peace, and adverse to war. The interests of commerce, which, through the enterprise of Christian nations, have penetrated almost every region of the earth, binding our race together by a more intimate intercourse and stronger fellowship, would be greatly injured by a state of war. These interests appeal to the rulers of mankind, and ask for peace.

The interests of science, civilization and Christianity implore the governments of the world to suppress wars. The scientific traveller desires to explore every square mile of the globe, to study its botany and mineralogy, its reptiles, birds and beasts, its soils and climates, its population and their manners and customs, their laws and religion, and thus to acquire and diffuse that knowledge which will enlarge and liberalize the mind, instruct commerce where to find supplies to purchase, and markets in which to sell, and teach agriculture by spreading the knowledge of the implements and tillage and productions best suited to the various soils and climates of the earth,

as ascertained by the experience of centuries. War obstructs all this, because, during a state of war, travellers are regarded with suspicion, if not arrested as spies.

Civilization and Christianity are making vigorous efforts to penetrate and enlighten the dark lands of barbarism and idolatry. The devout missionary looks forward with undoubting faith to the period when peace, universal and permanent, shall pervade the earth; when nations "shall beat their swords into plough-shares, and their spears into pruning-hooks;" and when "nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war anymore." He believes that the day is coming when the tactics of death and destruction will cease to be a study among men. He believes that the promised Messiah has come; that "of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end;" and that "he shall have dominion also from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth." He believes, that this great purpose is to be brought about by human agency, acting under the influence of the Spirit of God; and, with this faith, he goes forth to "preach the gospel to every creature," according to the command of his divine Master. His mission is one of love and peace. His purpose is to elevate man by instructing his mind and soul, and to make him a new creature in Christ Jesus. This work of missions, as the best means of converting heathen nations to the doctrines and faith of Christianity, has grown in popular favor with all classes of Christians. It has been adopted alike by Catholic and Protestant. It is relied on to bring all nations into a common brotherhood, by spreading over the earth a common religion, in which the same Decalogue, the same moral principles, shall be taught and embraced by all. This great object of Christian effort would be obstructed, if not entirely defeated, by the prevalence of wars. It is difficult, where peace and commercial intercourse exist between a Christian and an anti-Christian nation, for the missionary of the former to penetrate the territories, and conciliate the favor and esteem of the heathen. It would be impossible in a state of war.

The committee believe, that the petitions presented to them indicate that there is a strong religious and philanthropic sentiment pervading our whole country in favor of peace among all nations. This sentiment is universal among Christians of all denominations, in the opinion of the committee, and is manifesting itself through the petitions before us. The political strength of the Christians of our country is such as to command attention and respect on all occasions, even if we did not entirely concur in their views; but when, as in this case, the members of the committee heartily concur with what they believe to be the Christian sentiment of the country, it is an occasion for congratulation that they have the opportunity of co-operating with the memorialists in efforts to accomplish their noble purpose.

The committee recommend the adoption of the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Senate advise the President to secure, whenever it may be practicable, a stipulation in all treaties hereafter entered into with other nations, providing for the adjustment of any misunderstanding or controversy which may arise between the contracting parties, by referring the same to the decision of disinterested and impartial arbitrators, to be mutually chosen."

NO. III. ACTION OF THE VERMONT LEGISLATURE.

"The select Committee to whom were referred sundry memorials from citizens of this State, and also from the American Peace Society, on the subject of STIPULATED ARBITRATION as a substitute for WAR, submit the following

REPORT.

The evils of war are so well known, and so generally and justly deplored that every friend of his country or his race, must regard with favor any pro-

posals or efforts which may tend to supersede its necessity, and thus prevent its recurrence. Such is obviously the aim of these Petitioners; and for this purpose they propose a measure which seems entirely free from objection. Their plan contemplates no sudden or violent change of international policy but asks merely to have controversies between nations settled in essentially the same way that disputes now are between individuals and minor communities. It is not a new principle, but the extension and application of one as old as government itself, or civilized society, to the intercourse of nations. Society has provided for a peaceful and equitable determination of controversies, not only between individuals, but between such communities as towns, counties, and even states; and these Petitioners request that measures be taken to extend these principles and methods of peaceful justice so far as to provide, in advance, for the adjustment of all future misunderstandings without a resort to arms. All the legitimate objects of war they propose to accomplish by other and better means. They would not leave nations, more than individuals, without security for their rights and interests, but would provide rational, peaceful expedients for insuring both. According to Vattel, war alone settles no dispute, but merely makes the parties willing, after a sufficient experience of its evils, to employ for this purpose the very methods which these Petitioners wish nations to employ before fighting, and thus obviate the necessity of fighting at all. For this end, they propose "STIPULATED ARBITRATION," or an article in our treaties, (if a specific treaty be not entered into for that purpose,) binding the parties to settle whatever disputes may arise between them, not by the sword, but by umpires mutually chosen.

Now, a substitute for war, so simple, so feasible, and so likely to prove effective to a greater or less extent, seems to your Committee worthy of a fair and full experiment. It is in accordance not only with the obvious dictates of common sense and sound policy, but with the established principles of international law. It has often been adopted, in substance, by our own Government from its origin, but more especially within the last third of a century. It has also gradually been working itself, during the same period, into the practice of nearly all civilized nations; and thus the way is, in some measure, prepared for its formal adoption, as a part of their common and settled policy. Some nation, however, must take the lead in introducing it; and, since it is so peculiarly accordant with the genius of our own government and with the general course of its policy from the first, so congenial with the habits of the people, and so likely to subserve their highest permanent welfare, more especially the fast accumulating interests of peaceful industry, enterprise and skill, we think we shall only give utterance to the very general, if not universal sentiment of the people of Vermont, by recommending, as we do, the adoption of the following resolution, viz.:

Resolved, By the Senate and House of Representatives, That our Senators in Congress be instructed, and our Representatives be requested, to use their influence in such ways as they may deem most effectual, to secure, whenever practicable, a provision, in the treaties of our Government with other nations, for referring to the decision of umpires all misunderstandings that cannot be satisfactorily adjusted by amicable negotiation.

G. W. GRANDEY, *For the Committee.*"

This resolution was passed unanimously in both branches of the Legislature, signed by the Governor, and immediately forwarded to the Vermont Senators and Representatives in Congress. Vermont was the first to act in favor of Stipulated Arbitration, because her Legislature met first after our Society took measures to bring the subject before the State Legislatures.

NO. IV. ACTION OF THE RHODE ISLAND LEGISLATURE, *January, 1853.*
—An Endorsement of the Report, word for word, to the U. S. Senate, in 1851, by Mr. Foote.

“Whereas appeals to the sword for the determination of national controversies are always productive of immense evils; and whereas the spirit and enterprises of the age, but more especially the genius of our own government, the habits of our people, and the highest permanent prosperity of our Republic, as well as the claims of humanity, the dictates of enlightened reason, and the precepts of our holy religion, all require the adoption of every feasible measure, consistent with the national honor, and the security of our rights, to prevent, as far as possible, the recurrence of war hereafter; therefore,

Resolved, That, in the judgment of this General Assembly, it is desirable for the Government of these United States, whenever practicable, to secure in its treaties with other nations a provision for referring to the decision of umpires all future misunderstandings that cannot be satisfactorily adjusted by amicable negotiation, in the first instance, before a resort to hostilities shall be had.”

We could not learn that there was any opposition in either House to the above preamble and resolution.

NO. V. ACTION OF THE LEGISLATURE OF MAINE, *March, 1853.*

“Resolves in favor of Stipulated Arbitration as a Substitute for War.

Resolved, That wars of aggression and conquest, and appeals to arms by civilized nations for the settlement of national disputes, are, of all the remaining practices of early and barbarous ages, among the most inhuman and unchristian; that they are barriers to the intellectual, social and moral development of the human race, and at war with man's true mission and high destiny; and that duty to our institutions, our country and age requires that every suitable effort be made by our people, and by our state and national governments, to advance so great and desirable an end as universal peace between the nations of the earth.

Resolved, That to give effect, so far as we, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine, are able, to the principles, recommendations and conclusions of the Committee on Foreign Relations, adopted by said Committee in a recent report, made to the Senate of the United States, on this subject, the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State be, and hereby are, requested to use all proper and appropriate influence to secure, in treaties hereafter to be made with other nations, a provision for the settlement, by arbitration, of such national controversies as cannot be amicably adjusted by the parties to such treaties.

Resolved, That the Governor be requested to forward a copy of these resolves to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress, and to the President of the United States.”

These resolutions were passed unanimously in the House of Representatives, and, so far as appears from the record, unanimously in the Senate.

NO. VI. ACTION OF THE MASSACHUSETTS LEGISLATURE.

IN SENATE, *April 19, 1853.*

“The Joint Special Committee, to whom was committed the petition of the American Peace Society, praying for ‘such action as may be deemed best, in favor of having our national government, whenever practicable, secure, in its treaties with other nations, a provision for referring to the decision of umpires all future misunderstandings that cannot be satisfactorily adjusted by amicable negotiations,’ have taken the subject into consideration, and

REPORT:

That they fully concur with the petitioners in regard to the importance of superseding the custom of war, as the arbiter of disputes between nations, by

the adoption of peaceful substitutes that shall accomplish the great ends of international justice and security, more effectually than they can be accomplished by the sword.

The desirableness of such a result, none will question; and we deem it a matter of devout gratitude to the Author of all good, that the leading influences of the world have been, especially for the last third of a century, tending steadily and strongly to such a consummation. Of this there can be no doubt; for ever since the downfall of Napoleon, there has obviously been a growing aversion to war, and a disposition greater than ever before, to adjust international disputes by means other than the sword. The war spirit, though by no means extinct, has been held in check. Europe has, indeed, kept herself armed to the teeth; but she has, after all, carefully abstained from actual war. There has been a marked and most auspicious change; juster views, a better spirit, a policy more pacific and Christian, have been silently working their way among the nations. Difficulties that once would have inevitably plunged them in war, are now adjusted, often with scarce a thought of appealing to arms. Europe, after centuries of almost incessant warfare, has reposed in general peace for nearly forty years, even among such revolutionary provocations as would, fifty years before, have whelmed that whole continent in blood. Whatever the cause or the motive, the change is undeniable; and it marks the dawn of a new era in the policy of Christendom, and is gradually preparing the way for the adoption, sooner or later, of such substitutes for war as must, in time, supersede entirely its alleged necessity.

This plea of necessity for war is rather imaginary than real. There may, indeed, be a sort of necessity for it, but only such as there is for intemperance or duelling, for the slave-trade or piracy; a necessity arising not from the nature of the case, but solely from the wrong views and habits of men. Rectify these, and every plea of necessity will cease forever. There is in reality no more need of nations fighting each other for the adjustment of their difficulties, than there is of individuals in society for the settlement of theirs. 'Indeed,' said Dr. Johnson, 'it is exceedingly clear, that duelling having *better reasons* for its barbarous violence, is *more* justifiable than wars, in which thousands, without any cause of personal quarrel, go forth and massacre each other.' The war-system, as an arbiter of international justice, exists in Christendom solely because the people of Christendom still choose it; and whenever they shall change their views, and as a body resolve that the blind and brutal arbitrament of the sword shall cease, it must of necessity come to an end.

For this purpose, then, we need only a Christianized public sentiment rightly applied to the case. Opinion is sure, in the long run, to rule the world. There is no power among men that can match or withstand it. 'There is,' said the great American Statesman, 'something on earth greater than arbitrary or despotic power. The lightning has its power, and the whirlwind has its power, and the earthquake has its power; but there is something among men more capable of shaking despotic thrones than lightning, whirlwind or earthquake; and that is the excited and aroused indignation of the whole civilized world.'* 'The time has been,' said he, on another occasion, 'when fleets and armies and subsidies were the principal reliances even in the best cause; but, happily for mankind, there has arrived a great change in this respect, and the *public opinion* of the civilized world is rapidly gaining an ascendancy over mere brutal force. It is already able to oppose the most formidable obstruction to the progress of injustice and oppression; and as it grows more intelligent and more intense, it will be more and more formidable. It may be silenced by military power, but it cannot

* Daniel Webster's Speech at the Festival of the Sons of N. H., Nov 7, 1840. p. 75.

be conquered. It is elastic, irrepressible and invulnerable to the weapons of ordinary warfare. It is that impassable, inextinguishable enemy of mere violence and arbitrary rule, which, like Milton's angels,

Vital in every part,
Cannot, but by annihilating, die.

Until this be propitiated or satisfied, it is vain to talk either of triumphs or of repose. No matter what fields are desolated, what fortresses surrendered, what armies subdued, or what provinces overrun, there is an enemy that still exists to check the glory of these triumphs. It follows the conqueror back to the very scene of his ovations; it calls upon him to take notice, that the world, though silent, is yet indignant; it shows him that the sceptre of his victory is a barren sceptre, which shall confer neither joy nor honor, but shall moulder to dry ashes in his grasp. In the midst of his exultations it pierces his ear with the cry of injured justice; it denounces against him the indignation of an enlightened and civilized age; it turns to bitterness the cup of his rejoicing, and wounds him with the sting which belongs to the consciousness of having outraged the opinion of mankind.*

Now, we believe that public opinion is ripe for the simple measure proposed by the petitioners before us. We think it is substantially so throughout the civilized world, and are sure it is decidedly so among our own constituents. Massachusetts, though she struck the first blow of the Revolution, and sent forth to that struggle more troops than all the slaveholding States put together, has become a pioneer in the cause of peace; and such is now the popular sentiment throughout her borders, that we hazard nothing in presuming, that the great mass of her citizens are ready to sanction any feasible and effective substitutes for war.

On this point, we have at hand a superabundance of proof; but, passing over the resolves of her ecclesiastical bodies, and the habitual tone of her professing Christians and her press, those infallible criteria of popular sentiment on a topic like this, we will restrict ourselves to the action of our legislature. In 1835 the first petition was presented in favor of substitutes for war, particularly a Congress of Nations, and resolutions were passed, expressing 'the opinion, that *some* mode should be established for the amicable and final adjustment of all international disputes instead of a resort to arms.' Two years after, as also in 1838, the subject came again before the legislature; a long and elaborate report was presented by the Hon. Stephen Fairbanks; and resolutions, declaring it 'the duty of all civilized communities to unite in *any* practicable plan calculated to effect so noble an object as the abolition of war, and the preservation of peace among the nations of the earth,' were adopted, with a request for their transmission "to the President of the United States, and to the Executive of each of the States, to be communicated to their respective legislatures;" a document to which are appended the honored names of Robert C. Winthrop, as Speaker of the House, Myron Lawrence, as President of the Senate, and Edward Everett, as Governor of the State. The subject, moreover, was brought before the legislature in subsequent years; and in 1844, after stating that "some of the purest and most gifted minds in either hemisphere have poured the light of reason and of revelation upon the practice of war, until multitudes have come to the conclusion, that a custom so fraught with physical and moral evil, so noxious to the dearest interests of social life, and so hostile to the first principles of natural and revealed religion, cannot be necessary; that individuals and communities are bound to regulate their intercourse on the same principles; and that legal adjudications, therefore, should take the place of physical force for the maintenance of national rights," they adopted a series of resolutions, commending 'arbitration as a practical and desirable substitute for war,' but especially 'a system of adjudication founded on a

* Speeches, Vol. I., Ed. 1848, p. 253.

well-digested code of international laws, and administered by a standing court or board of mutual reference.' The governor was requested to transmit the report and resolves 'to the senators and representatives of Massachusetts in Congress, with instructions to use their influence in furtherance of this important object.' It is worthy of special remark, that the vote in all these cases was nearly, and in some entirely, unanimous; and no objection to this action of the legislature, has ever, to our knowledge, been made by any portion of the people of Massachusetts.

It is clear, then, that public opinion among our own constituents is decidedly in favor of peaceful substitutes for war; and in commending the measure suggested by the petitioners, we shall only tread in the footsteps of former legislatures, and echo the views and wishes of nearly, if not quite, every intelligent man in the State.

Indeed, it is difficult to start a plausible objection against so simple and so reasonable a substitute for war. It relinquishes no right, sacrifices no interest, but provides the best possible means for securing both. It is also well adapted to the present state of the world, and entirely consistent alike with the precepts of Christianity, and the dictates of sound policy. It commends itself strongly to every man's common sense as safe and wise, as just, feasible, and likely to prove effective. There is no stamp of political quackery on its brow—nothing about it that is either quixotic or empyrical; it simply proposes that nations agree hereafter to settle their disputes in essentially the same way that individuals do theirs—by negotiation if they can, but if not, then by reference, as their last resort, to umpires mutually chosen.

We may observe, as one felicity of this measure, that it is entirely aloof from the ordinary issues of politics. Like the general government over us, or like the air we breathe, it belongs alike to all in every party and every section; nor do we see how it is possible for any ingenuity of perversion to turn it into a watch-word of sectional jealousy, or into a foot-ball of party strife.

Another recommendation of the measure is found in its obvious and striking coincidence with the peaceful basis of our Union. The thirty-one States of our confederacy, each as independent in some respects, as Great Britain or France, have adopted, for the amicable adjudication of their controversies, the same principle of reference that the friends of peace wish the great brotherhood of nations to apply for the peaceful adjustment of theirs. When a dispute arises between any of our States, they do not dream of rushing to arms for its settlement by fraternal slaughter, but jointly appeal to the standing referees provided by the constitution in our national judiciary, and calmly await its decision as an end of the matter. Here is the principle in successful operation. We have been putting it in practice among ourselves for nearly seventy years; and this long experience of its safety, efficacy, and inestimable value, might well be expected to prepare us for its cheerful adoption in our intercourse with other nations.

This measure, moreover, is entirely compatible with every variety of views prevalent among us on the subject of peace. On this point there is a wide and well-known diversity of sentiment. Some regard all war as wrong, while others look upon war, in strict self-defence, as an imperative duty of patriotism. The advocates of both these opinions may consistently unite in the plan of superseding war by peaceful substitutes. No matter whether we believe war always wrong, or sometimes right, whether we would disband our army and dismantle our navy, or would increase them both two-fold or even ten-fold, we may, on any of these suppositions, sincerely deprecate war, and desire to avert it by any expedient not morally wrong, that promises a result so devoutly to be wished.

To this measure, however, there is one objection that has much currency, but deserves little respect. We hardly know how to embody it in a definite

statement; but it commonly talks somewhat in this strain,—‘we are republicans, while the rest of the world are nearly all monarchists; and we can have little hope of justice from those who hate our example, as a model republic, and would gladly blot it from the earth.’ It is a low, vulgar prejudice, as lame in its logic as it is reprehensible in its spirit. The reasoning, if such it can be called, strangely assumes,—otherwise it could have no force,—that questions touching the distinctive forms of government in different countries, will be referred to arbitration; questions which no treaty within our knowledge ever did, and none, we presume, ever will, submit to the decision of umpires. With such points, every government, whatever its form, sternly refuses to let any foreigner intermeddle. This feeling is universal. Democracy is not alone in its dread and its scorn of such interference. You cannot find, in all Christendom, a despotism, a monarchy or an oligarchy, that would not resent it quite as indignantly as we should ourselves. Indeed, the idea is a mere bugbear—nobody dreams of referring such issues to arbitration; nor in all our controversies with other nations can we recollect a single one that turned on the peculiarities of our government. The points in dispute had no reference to these, but were such as belong to men under all governments alike. No other points will ever be submitted to reference. We cannot conceive why democracy or oligarchy, monarchy or despotism itself, any form of government should necessarily disqualify its subjects to act as umpires on the ordinary issues between individuals or communities. Is all sense of justice, all perception of right and wrong, all power or probability of a righteous judgment on disputes between man and man, restricted to our own republic? Are there no men in England or France, none in imperial Austria, none even under the shadow of Russian autocracy, as capable as ourselves of rightly deciding such controversies as arise in the daily intercourse of mankind? The objection is discreditable to republican candor and intelligence. If you doubt the wisdom of employing rulers as umpires, then we say there is no need of selecting them. Such men as Lord Mansfield or Judge Marshall, Robert Peel or Daniel Webster, would doubtless be far preferable. The plan gives each party an equal voice in the selection of referees; and such a provision must surely be deemed an ample security for the rights of both.

There is, however, no need of so extended an argument to justify a measure so reasonable as that proposed by the petitioners. As representing the general sentiment of Massachusetts on this subject, we cannot do less than recommend the adoption of the accompanying resolutions.

For the Committee,

GEORGE HOWLAND, JR.

RESOLVES IN FAVOR OF PEACEFUL SUBSTITUTES FOR WAR.

Resolved, That we deem it both proper and desirable for the government of the United States, whenever practicable, to secure in its treaties with foreign powers, a provision for referring to the decision of umpires, all controversies that cannot be satisfactorily adjusted by negotiation.

Resolved, That the Governor be requested to transmit these resolutions and the accompanying report to our senators and representatives in Congress, with the expression of our desire that they will use their influence in such way as they may deem best, for the accomplishment of this object.”

These resolutions were passed in both houses without opposition.

TERMS—Advocate of Peace, monthly, 16 pp. one vol. in two years; \$1.00 in advance.

Book of Peace, 12 mo., 606 pp., \$1 00

Tracts, unbound, at 12 pp. for a cent.

Upham on Peace, 25

Hancock on Peace, 25

Dymond on War, 19

Peace Manual, paper covers, 19—cloth, 25

Jay's Review of Mexican War, cloth, 50c; paper covers, 30c. Livermore do. A very liberal discount for re-sale, or gratuitous distribution.

AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY'S OFFICE, 21 Cornhill, Boston. GEO. C. BECKWITH, Corresponding Secretary; WM C. BROWN, Office Agent.